(*b*) whether the proceedings under the same section are now pending against Mr. Srinivasa Bharathi;

(*c*) whether the Government were consulted in the matter before the proceedings were started; and

(*d*) whether the Government propose to take any action in the matter and if not, why not?

A.—(*a*) (i) Yes.

(ii) As they failed to give security they were committed to prison under section 123 (1) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

(*b*) No.

(*c*) No.

(*d*) No. The Government see no reason to interfere.

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS

Co-operative Societies

Recruitment of Agricultural graduates to Co-operative department.

2034 Q.—Mr. P. Bhaktavatsulu Nayudu: Will the hon. the Minister for Development be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government felt the necessity of recruiting Agricultural graduates to the staff of the Co-operative department and advertised for Agricultural graduates on two occasions for the post of Assistant Registrars;

(*b*) whether the Government have so far appointed any Agricultural graduate in the Co-operative department, and if not, why not; and

(*c*) whether, in view of the recommendations of the Royal Commission and the Townsend Committee, the Government intend recruiting any Agricultural graduate as Deputy Registrar?

A.—(*a*) The Government have laid down that Assistant Registrars of Co-operative societies will generally be recruited from graduates who have specialized in Economics or Agriculture. In 1925, the Staff Selection Board, which was asked to select sixteen candidates for eight posts of Assistant Registrars, invited applications from graduates whose special subjects were Economics or Agriculture. The other occasion was in 1928 when the Registrar advertised for the post of Assistant Registrars, but the Government are not aware of the exact terms of the advertisement.

(*b*) One was appointed as Assistant Registrar, but he subsequently declined to accept the appointment.

(*c*) The Government have no such proposal under consideration at present, but due weight will be given to the recommendations of the Royal Commission and the Townsend Committee when an occasion arises.

[27th March 1929

Forests

Classification of forests in North Arcot district.

2035 *Q.*—Mr. T. Adinarayana Chettiyar: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that except one reserved forest in Tiruvannamalai range, North Arcot district, all ranges (reserves) were classified as second (first) class to be controlled by the Forest department;

(*b*) whether such a classification was made only after the report of a District Forest Committee presided over by the District Collector;

(*c*) what are the recommendations of the Committee and whether Government will be pleased to lay the report on the table of this House;

(*d*) who were the members of the Committee and what are the special qualifications of the members to advise on 'Forest' matters;

(*e*) whether it is a fact that these reserves were recently reclassified as peoples' reserves and left under the control of village panchayats;

(*f*) what were the circumstances that led to the subsequent change of policy and on whose report this change was effected; and

(*g*) what is the provision made for the supply of fuel, etc., to Tiruvannamalai town under the peoples' forests and whether the report and Government Orders thereon will be placed on the table of this House?

A.—(*a*) No. The following ten reserves were alone placed under Class I:—

(1) Valasamalai, (2) Nattampalli, (3) P. Swami Malai, (4) Ponniar, (5) Pavunjupet, (6) Annamalai, (7) Kavathimalai, (8) Kannamadai, (9) Radhapuram and (10) Tippakadu.

(*b*) Yes.

(*c*) An extract of the recommendations of the Committee is appended.

(*d*) The following gentlemen were members of the Committee:—

(1) Mr. A. G. Leach, Collector—President,
(2) Diwan Bahadur W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar, B.A., B.L., M.L.C., President of the North Arcot District Board,
(3) Rao Sahib Seshachala Ayyar of Tiruvannamalai taluk,
(4) Mr. Abdulla Ghattala, B.A., B.L., M.L.C., Council Secretary,
(5) Mr. H. W. A. Gaudoin, District Forest Officer, South Vellore,
(6) Mr. S. V. Devadasan, District Forest Officer, North Vellore, and
(7) Mr. D. L. Sathe, District Forest Officer, West Vellore.

(*e*) The Class I reserves Nos. 7—10 were reclassified under Class III and transferred to panchayat management.

(*f*) The reclassification was done at the instance of the Board of Revenue on the principle that the Forest Department should not devote its attention on reserves which are not very valuable.

(*g*) So far as the panchayat forests are concerned, the supply of fuel to Tiruvannamalai and other places is controlled by the Panchayats. A copy of G.O. No. 750, dated 19th April 1928, is placed on the table.[a]

---

[a] Printed as Appendix IX on pages 1048-1049 infra.

27th March 1929]

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The number of questions of which notice was received during this session was 2,464, admittted and answered 2,197, disallowed 166, withdrawn 56, referred back to Members of the Legislative Council 35, short notice not waived 10 and questions remaining to be answered nil (applause)."

[*Note.*—**An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.**]

II

MOTIONS ON THE BUDGET FOR 1929-30.

DEMAND XXIX—LABOUR INCLUDING FACTORIES—*cont.*

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti may continue his speech on Mr. Adinarayana Chetti's motion."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Having regard to the shortness of time before us before we finish the budget demands I wish to place only one or two facts. I was speaking the other day that the Labour Commissioner was making himself conspicuous by his absence and that there was no justification for his absence. I say that anybody who had studied the programme of the railways in regard to the further machinations of the workshops ought to have anticipated this strike, and as a guide, philosopher and friend studied the grievances of the workmen and negotiated with the Railway authorities for an early settlement before the labourers went on strike. I consider that the duty of the Labour Commissioner is to watch the progress of events in every factory and mill and in every place where there is large employment of labour and to see that the grievances of these workmen are redressed without allowing them to go on strike. With these few words I second the cut motion."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The question is to reduce the allotment of Rs. 47,300 for Commissioner of Labour by Rs. 100."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"Mr. President, I am very thankful to have an opportunity of supporting this cut motion, because last time when I brought in a similar motion under a different rule and Standing Order for condemning the action of the Government for not interfering through their Labour Commissioner with the Railway authorities I had to withdraw it under circumstances beyond my control. My Friends of the Justice party complained that they could not vote with me at that time. . . An opportunity has come to me again and I hope my Friends in the Justice party will prove their well-known sympathy and concern for the labourers who are all non-Brahmans, by walking into the same lobby with us in this cut motion which is intended to censure the Government and the Labour Commissioner for not interfering with the Railway authorities.

"I want to draw the attention of the House to a communiqué issued by the Government on 31st August 1928 in which they refer to the suggestion made in the press and elsewhere that Government ought to interfere with the Railway authorities. . . "

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The grant will be put to vote at 12-18 p.m., i.e., 18 minutes after 12, and Mr. Slater is also anxious to speak."

* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"Is he? I am very glad. Then, I shall finish my speech within two or three minutes.